1609|5290

REMARKS

ON

THE REV. MR. BARNARD's

DISCOURSE

ON

BAPTISM,

IN

THREE LETTERS TO A FRIEND.

BY WILLIAM PRICE.

What doth our arguing reprove? JOB.

Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our Father. JOHN THE BAPTIST.

Henceforth we know no man after the flesh. PAUL.

Search the Scriptures. JESUS CHRIST.

LEEDS:

Printed by JAMES BOWLING, and may be had at the Vestry of EBENEZER CHAPEL.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

1609/5290

So much has been ſaid, and wrote already on Baptiſm, that the repeated ſolicitations of a friend could not have prevailed with the Writer of the ſubſequent pages to publiſh his Remarks on Mr. Barnard's Pamphlet, but as ſome of the Ideas Mr. B. has ſuggeſted, are rather out of the common line, and his performance has been thought by ſome to be unanſwerable.

It is needleſs to make an apology for this publication.—Every one has a right to judge for himſelf upon religious ſubjects, and to publiſh his ſentiments to the world.—To engage in controverſy, is, particularly to the author of the enſuing remarks, a diſagreeable work,—he earneſtly wiſhes ever to continue on terms of Chriſtian friendſhip and intimacy with his pædobaptiſt brethren; and hopes the freedom he now takes, will give no offence, if it be remembered that different publications have lately appeared on the other ſide of the queſtion.—He profeſſes a ſincere regard for all that love the Lord Jeſus Chriſt in ſincerity.

30
65
DEC

REMARKS, &c.

LETTER I.

DEAR SIR,

THE pamphlet you refer to, viz. *The Rev. Mr. Barnard's Diſcourſe on Baptiſm*, I have lately peruſed; and notwithſtanding my ſtrong averſion to controverſy, I am inclined for once to comply with your requeſt, by giving you the ſubſtance of ſuch remarks as occurred to me in reading the above performance. This I ſhall endeavour to do (to uſe our author's words) "with all plainneſs, and without deſigning to give offence to any one;" and I hope that publiſhing my ſentiments, will give Mr. B. no greater offence, than his publication has given me. I do not feel myſelf under any temptation to drop one word that might reaſonably be thought to proceed from what is commonly denominated a *bad ſpirit*.

" Baptiſm" (ſays Mr. Barnard) " is a ſubject about which there has been much diſpute in the world, owing, I preſume (chiefly") he might have ſaid altogether " to the different views which different people have, of

" I. The ſubjects to whom,

" II. The manner how ;—And

" III. The purpoſes for which it ought to be adminiſtered.

" I. With reſpect to the ſubjects.

" Under this head, brethren," ſays Mr. B. " I have to inform you, that Baptiſm is no *Church Ordinance.*"

Well, but what is baptiſm? " It is an ordinance," ſays our author, " to be adminiſtered *out of*, or before the ſubject be admitted as a member of any particular church whatſoever." For a proof of this he refers us to Dr. Gill's Body of Divinity.

But our pædo-baptiſt brethren differ very widely among themſelves upon this ſubject. Some of them ſpeak of Baptiſm as an ordinance of admiſſion, or (as they call it) a *door into the church.*

church. Mr. B. calls it, or rather more cautiouſly ſays, it " *appears* to be a *diſpenſation* ordinance, or an ordinance by which the ſubjects are *ceremonially initiated* into the Goſpel diſpenſation, or *incorporated* among that body of people, who are brought to profeſs that *Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God*; which outwardly diſtinguiſhes them from the body of Jews, who deny that plain fact." But when I read Matt. viii. 29. Mark v. 7. Luke viii. 28. Jam. ii. 19. I am fully convinced that baptiſm is not abſolutely neceſſary to qualify any one to be a member of that extenſive corporation. And really, Sir, if our Author did not deſign to give us any offence, I think he has treated us rather roughly, in placing (without any *ceremony)* our Children ſo ſnugly among the body of Jews; for although *we* can find neither a command, nor an example in all the New Teſtament for this *ceremonial* initiation, or diſpenſation *rite*, which Mr. B. ſo ſtrenuouſly pleads for; yet we have never been able to diſcover what privileges the children of our Pœdo-baptiſt brethren enjoy, ſuperior to ours.

The alarming circumſtance is, " They are not *ceremonially initiated*, ſo as to be diſtinguiſhed from the body of Jews." I ſhould be glad to know, from what ſource of intelligence Mr. B. has obtained the important information, that we cannot be diſtinguiſhed from Jews

without water-baptiſm, which he ſo elegantly ſtyles " a *ceremonial* initiation into the goſpel diſpenſation."

" Baptiſm *ſeems*,"—He begins this paragraph, one would ſuppoſe, with ſome degree of diffidence—it " SEEMS to be to us what circumciſion was to the Jews, viz. a diſpenſation rite; and if baptiſm be not the initiating rite into the goſpel diſpenſation, we ſhould be glad to be informed what is." It is but fair to requeſt, that Mr. B. would firſt inform us, where he has ever read of being *initiated into a diſpenſation*. If he was to adhere more cloſely to ſcripture, we ſhould be better able to underſtand his meaning. It ſeems to me, that he has paid more attention to the writings or aſſertions of uninſpired men, than to the word of God, upon this ſubject. Indeed the force of prejudice in favor of a cuſtom that has been ſo long ſanctioned by great and good men, is, I believe, much ſtronger than we are in general aware of.

But how, Sir, can baptiſm be to us what circumciſion was to the Jews? Were not the Jewiſh children as much members of the Jewiſh National Church, as my children are members of my family? Yes, and *as ſuch* the male part of them were circumciſed; not circumciſed in order to *become ſuch*, or to be *initiated*; for we are told that

that the *uncircumciſed* male (continuing ſo) was to be cut off from his people. Surely then he muſt have been conſidered as connected with them, without that which Mr. B. calls an initiating rite.* But although the ſeed of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, were to be circumciſed in conſequence of God's expreſs command, and likewiſe to partake of the paſſover as ſoon as it was inſtituted, without any other qualification, that we read of, than that of being the deſcendants of thoſe choſen men of God; yet, when the Jewiſh ceremonies were about to be abrogated, and John the Baptiſt came to point to the Lamb of God, who put an end to all the *ceremonial rites*, he forbad the people even ſo much as think to ſay within themſelves, We have Abraham to our father. And ſince the New Teſtament diſpenſation took place, the Apoſtle tells us, that henceforth we know no man after the fleſh.

Mr. B. acknowleges that children are not proper ſubjects for church-membership.† "Yet ſurely they are as proper ſubjects of a *diſpenſation* as were the children of the Jews at *Eight* Days old." I wiſh he had condeſcended to inform us what

* That threatening ſeems not to have affected the child till he was grown up, and wilfully neglected that ordinance of God for himſelf. *Brown's Scripture Dictionary.*

† So Mr. B. differs from moſt of his brethren, by not allowing Infants a place in the *viſible Church!*

what he means by *proper ſubjects of a diſpenſation*, and whether the children of the Jews were under any diſpenſation at *ſeven* days old. Poor infants, we may reaſonably ſuppoſe that many of them died, as many do in our day, without arriving at the age of Eight Days, and to circumciſe them ſooner than the time ſpecified in the command, would have been ſinful. To be ſure now, to the great comfort of parents; children, particularly if likely to die, may be bleſt with the privilege of being initiated into the goſpel diſpenſation, as ſoon as they come into the world! for I ſuppoſe Mr. B. will think them as proper ſubjects of a diſpenſation on the day they are born, as the children of the Jews were at Eight Days old.

But, ſays our author, "there appears to be an agreement between Circumciſion and Baptiſm. For was circumciſion by expreſs command? ſo alſo was baptiſm." He might as well have ſaid, Was the building of Solomon's Temple by expreſs command? ſo alſo was baptiſm! Now, Sir, when we mention any Two inſtitutions, both of which are by expreſs command, does it therefore follow, that they muſt be the ſame in their nature, and intended for the ſame purpoſe, or that one of them is to be a ſubſtitute in the room of the other?

Was the ſubject in circumciſion paſſive? ſo

he

he is likewiſe in baptiſm; the compariſon is really curious; he might as well have aſked, " Were Aaron and his ſons paſſive when they were waſhed and anointed in the ceremony of conſecration? ſo are we likewiſe in baptiſm.

" Was the belief in, and the profeſſion of, the One True God neceſſary for adults before they were circumciſed?" To which I beg leave to anſwer, that neither Mr. B. nor you, nor I, nor any one elſe, can prove that ſuch qualifications were ever required in the Old Teſtament, previous to circumciſion, as the New Teſtament requires previous to baptiſm.

" Were the Jewiſh children initiated into that (the Jewiſh) diſpenſation, without the belief in, and the profeſſion of, the One True God? They were, and this ſeems to me to have been the Apoſtle's conduct in initiating into the goſpel diſpenſation." It may *ſeem* ſo to Mr. B. but it does not ſeem ſo to me, eſpecially from the paſſage he refers to, which we ſhall conſider in its proper place. Again, Mr. B. aſks, " Was there nothing in the nature and ſignification of circumciſion, which forbad its application to children? There was not, nor is there any thing in the ſignification of Baptiſm, (if we may take Mr. B.'s word for it) that forbids its application to the like ſubjects, ſeeing they are not only capable of the thing itſelf, but alſo of what is ſignified thereby." But this aſſertion wants a proof;

proof; he might as well have ſaid, that a child is capable of taking an oath, becauſe he is capable of having a book applied to his lips. As to the circumciſion of infants, we know it was by the expreſs command of God; therefore there could not have been any thing in its nature, &c. to forbid its application, to thoſe whom he himſelf pointed out as the proper ſubjects of that inſtitution. But what has all this to do with Infant Baptiſm, concerning which we have neither a command nor a precedent in all the bible?

All that Mr. B. can aſcertain relative to the capability of our dear infants, in this caſe, amounts to—What?—Nothing, without a Divine injunction.

Our author goes on very rapidly;—let us follow him:—"Was circumciſion, (ſays he) a mark or a badge of diſtinction among the Jews? So is baptiſm among us who profeſs chriſtianity." I ſuppoſe he means that circumciſion was a mark, or badge, whereby the Jews were diſtinguiſhed from other nations.

The Jews, under the Old Teſtament diſpenſation, Sir, were a National Church, that had ſprung from Abraham's houſe; their *male* children were circumciſed at eight days old, according to God's command. It is no part of my buſineſs now, to enter upon the inveſtigation of the

the nature and design of circumcision; I have only, at present, to do with what Mr. B. has advanced concerning it. He takes it for granted (without attempting either to prove or explain) that they were initiated into the former dispensation by circumcision. But I would ask him, Under what dispensation were those who constituted the Church in the Wilderness, during about thirty eight, or almost forty years, when they did not practise circumcision? We are told, Josh. v. 4, &c. that, All the people that came out of Egypt, that were males, even all the men of war, died in the wilderness, by the way, after they came out of Egypt.—But all the people *that were born* in the wilderness, by the way, as they came forth out of Egypt, *them* they had not circumcised.

But were those people then under no dispensation? Did their fathers enjoy greater privileges in the wilderness than they? Had they not the Gospel dispensed unto them in the sacrifices, types, and shadows of good things to come?

Our author adds, "Did circumcision give a ceremonial or legal right to the Passover? It did, and so does baptism to the Lord's Supper." If baptism SO gives a *ceremonial* right to the Lord's Supper, why does not Mr. B. give the Lord's Supper to those who have been privileged with this *ceremony*, "seeing they are not only

capable of baptiſm, but alſo of what is ſignified thereby!" Are they not full *as* capable of what is ſignified by the Lord's Supper? Why ſhould he *grant* this *right*, and then ſnatch it away the moment it is granted, by requiring ſome *other qualifications*. He ſays, They muſt be "judged otherwiſe properly qualified for the ſame." The Jews did not uſe their children in this manner when the Paſſover was inſtituted. Our author (if I underſtand him) intimates, that *the Lord's Supper is inſtituted in the room of the Paſſover, as well as Baptiſm in the room of Circumciſion.* Now, Sir, ſuppoſe we were to admit all this as a fact, what would it prove? Why, the inconſiſtency of my friend Mr. B. for the Jewiſh children were to partake of the Paſſover. This was the plain rule; *They were to take a Lamb, either for one whole houſe, or for two adjoining houſes, according to the number of ſouls; according to their eating, they were to make count for the Lamb.* Exod. xii. If our Pædobaptiſt brethren will not conform to the rules of the Paſſover, ſo far as to bring their children to the Lord's Supper, why do they baptize them according to the rule of circumciſion? Will Mr. B. ſay, there are peculiar qualifications required in the New Teſtament for the Lord's Supper? The Baptiſts urge, with equal reaſon, that the ſame book requires peculiar and expreſs qualifications for baptiſm.

As

As to the example of the " Three Thouſand, in the Acts of the Apoſtles (chap. ii.) who gladly received the word, were baptized—and afterwards added to the church," we are very well acquainted with it; but that example furniſhes us with no intelligence concerning the cauſe which Mr. B. undertakes to defend; nor have I found any other example in all the New Teſtament that will afford any ſupport to the cauſe of Infant Baptiſm.

" Were the uncircumciſed cut off? They were, from their people, and the privileges of an Iſraelite." Then, as was obſerved already, they muſt have been connected with that body of people they were cut off from. And have we not, in the ceremonial law, a great number of other injunctions, for the neglect of which, an Iſraelite was to be cut off from among his people? But the New Teſtament, in reference to baptiſm, knows nothing of ſuch an awful threatening, although Mr. B. (very unguardedly) ſays, " So alſo are the *unbaptized* cut off from the body of profeſſing chriſtians, and from ALL church privileges whatſoever. Dreadful! What, are they all *ſo cut off*, as *the uncircumciſed male-child was cut off from his people?* Nay, I am afraid Mr. B. will " ſo alſo" cut off all our unbaptiſed *female* children. And likewiſe our Friends, the people called *Quakers*, are all of them completely ſever'd off, at one blow, from

the body of profeſſing chriſtians. The uncircumciſed man-child was cut off from every connection with that nation, and every privilege whatever, both civil and religious; and to be cut off from all their national privileges was an awful judgment. What Mr. B. ſays, upon this ſubject, would have become a member of a National Church, much better than it becomes a Proteſtant Diſſenter of the Congregational Perſuaſion.

" Was circumciſion of ſpiritual ſignification? It was." And what then? Were not other Jewiſh ceremonies of ſpiritual ſignification? " So alſo" ſays our author, " is baptiſm, and repreſents to us the ſame things." What, all the the things that circumciſion was a *token* of to Abraham? He may as well ſay, that the Lord *will give us, and our ſeed after us, all the land of Canaan for an everlaſting poſſeſſion!* Gen. xvii. 8,—11. The Two paſſages Mr. B. refers to will by no means ſuit his purpoſe; for neither of them mentions a ſyllable of that circumciſion, in the room of which he ſubſtitutes baptiſm. The Apoſtle, in Rom. ii. 29. ſpeaks of the *circumciſion of the heart:* and in Col. ii. 11. he ſpeaks of the ſame, and tells the Coloſſians, that *in Chriſt* they were circumciſed with the circumciſion *made without hands*, &c. And becauſe the Apoſtle adds in the next verſe, *Buried with him in baptiſm*, &c.

&c. ſome have thought proper to call baptiſm "the Chriſtian Circumciſion," and repreſent it, as Mr. B. does, as a ſubſtitute in the room of the Jewiſh circumciſion. But (as Dr. Stennett obſerves, in his anſwer to Mr. Addington) 'The circumciſion, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, is expreſsly ſaid to be MADE WITHOUT HANDS: and how ſtrange to make him ſay, that baptiſm, which is MADE WITH HANDS, was ſubſtituted in the room of that which was MADE WITHOUT HANDS!' The truth is, there is not one word ſaid of baptiſm's being ſubſtituted in the room of circumciſion. All that the Apoſtle means to ſay, is, "That in Chriſt, or by the influence of his Doctrine upon their hearts, they were, after a ſpiritual manner, circumciſed to love and fear God; and that they were buried with Chriſt in baptiſm, by which inſtitution was expreſſed, in a very lively manner, their reſurrection, through Divine Faith, to newneſs of life." He gives us no intimation at all, that he even means to draw a parallel between circumciſion and baptiſm; much leſs that he means to ſay, this was prefigured by that, and deſigned to take place of it.

"But," ſays Mr. B. "ſhould any ſay, after all, that the Jewiſh children were received into that diſpenſation by expreſs command, we grant it." That the Jewiſh children (i. e.) *the male children*, were to be circumciſed *at eight days old*, by expreſs

expreſs command, we all know; and this was a peculiar mark, by which they were diſtinguiſhed from all other nations. It remained in force until Chriſt came, and *the bleſſing of Abraham came on the Gentiles.* (Gal. iii.) National diſtinctions then ceaſed; and now *there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Chriſt Jeſus.* Gal. iii. 28, 29. Why then ſhould we attempt to ſubſtitute any thing *now* in the room of that badge of national diſtinction, without a warrant from the Word of God? It evidently appears to me (as I think it muſt to every impartial perſon) that the Apoſtles never thought of ſuch a circumſtance; for, in their days, the chriſtians, converted from Judaiſm, were exceedingly inclined, and zealous to incorporate Circumciſion with Chriſtianity. Their zeal, in this matter, became very troubleſome to the churches. What method do the Apoſtles take to remedy this evil? Do they ever inſtruct them, that they need not be ſo tenacious of one poſitive rite, ſince another was appointed in its ſtead, to be adminiſtered to the like ſubjects? Such an obſervation would have been very much to the purpoſe, and the moſt likely that could be, to give the Judaizing Chriſtians ſatisfaction; and therefore it is natural to ſuppoſe that the Apoſtles would have taken this method, if the fact were really ſo, that baptiſm was ſubſtituted in the room of

circum-

circumciſion. But do they go this way to work? Nothing is to be found of it, in all their reaſonings, to diſſuade chriſtians from circumciſion. They warn chriſtians, that the zealots for circumciſion were *ſubverters* of men's ſouls, &c. Acts xv. 24. *That if they were circumciſed Chriſt ſhould profit them nothing*, &c.—But they never go about to ſoften the Jews, by telling them, that Chriſtianity has another rite *in its ſtead*. And yet this way of dealing with men, is not more ſoft than it was likely to prove effectual, if it were ſo, that baptiſm was the ſubſtitute of circumciſion. Now, becauſe the Apoſtles never talk in this ſtrain, it ſeems natural to infer they never thought ſo,* and (to uſe Mr. B.'s words) "as no intimation thereof is given in God's word, we conclude that God had no ſuch intention."

"Another argument with which we ſupport the rite of Infant Baptiſm, is, the total ſilence of the Word of God."—I confeſs, Sir, if I had been in Mr. B.'s ſituation, I ſhould have felt myſelf rather mortified, in being obliged to have recourſe to an argument founded on "the total ſilence of the Word of God;" and yet I cannot imagine how a practice, never once mentioned in Divine Revelation, can be better ſupported, than by inſiſting on the total ſilence of the ſcriptures.

"The

* See a Courſe of Letters to Bp. Hoadly. P. 121, 122.

" The Word of God is totally ſilent relative to"—to what?—Not to Baptiſm, which we find ſo often mentioned as to leave us under no neceſſity of arguing from the ſilence of ſcripture, and concerning which every direction is given that we can reaſonably wiſh for.

Our Saviour has condeſcended not only to ſet us an example, but alſo to point out expreſsly in the commiſſion, what is required, both on the adminiſtrator's part, and on the part of the ſubject; teaching, on the miniſter's part, according to Matthew (chap. xxviii. 19.) and believing, on the ſubject's part, according to Mark (chap. xvi. 16. and Acts viii. 37.) neither of which is hinted at as a pre-requiſite for circumciſion.

I think a mind entirely free from any predilection, in favor of a previouſly adopted hypotheſis, cannot be much embarraſſed in his ſearch for the plain meaning of our Saviour in the above commiſſion; eſpecially if he pay any attention to what Luke, the ſacred hiſtorian, has recorded in the Acts of the Apoſtles, where we have ſufficient intelligence reſpecting the manner how the Apoſtles, and other Miniſters executed their commiſſion.—They taught, or preached the Goſpel to all rational creatures that came within the reach of their miniſtry—the Spirit of God accom-

accompanying the word, ſinners were brought to repent and believe—and, upon profeſſion of faith, were baptiſed; and ſo expreſs is Luke in his account, that he particularly mentions MEN and WOMEN.

Now, Sir, let us return to the argument with which our author ſupports the rite of Infant Baptiſm, viz. the total ſilence of the Word of God, relative to perſons being baptized in adult years, who were born of baptized parents. He very candidly admits (what no one ever pretended to deny) that adults were baptized. "But then," ſays Mr. B. "who were their parents?" This is a queſtion, which, I verily believe, would have puzzled Luke himſelf; for during what our author calls "An hiſtory of upwards of *thirty* years," we never read of ſuch a queſtion being put to any of thoſe converts who were baptized. No, Sir, the Apoſtles, and other Miniſters of Chriſt, who then travelled through different parts, preaching the Goſpel (and ſometimes viſited the ſame parts more than once) did not require of thoſe converts an account of their parents. Whether they were *baptized*, or *unbaptized*, it made no difference. "Although," ſays Mr. B. "the Acts of the Apoſtles contain an hiſtory of upwards of thirty years, yet, in all that ſpace of time, there is not one recorded as being baptized in adult years, who was born of baptized parents." And is there one recorded

as being baptized in infancy? If not, what muſt become of this mighty argument? What does it prove? "Why," ſays our author, "it is a clear proof to us, that the delay of Infant Baptiſm was not at that time practiſed." Let him firſt prove that Infant Baptiſm was at all practiſed at that time, and then let him exclaim againſt *practiſing the delay of it!* I ſhall ſay nothing concerning the propriety or impropriety of the phraſe.

But Mr. B. talks as though we were to expect, in the Acts of the Apoſtles, an account of the genealogy of thoſe who were converted and baptized. Let us give his arguments (founded on the total ſilence of ſcripture) its full ſcope.

Luke, in the Acts of the Apoſtles, gives us a very intereſting account of the preaching and ſucceſs of the Goſpel. Men and Women believed—were baptized—particular churches were formed, in different parts, where the Apoſtles and other Miniſters travelled.

Luke did not undertake to write a hiſtory of the children, or poſterity of thoſe converts, or to inform us, who were afterwards converted, baptized and added to thoſe particular churches.

Ergo, the delay of Infant Baptiſm was not at that time practiſed! And Mr. B. inſiſts upon it,

it, that Infant Baptiſm is now clearly proved. Our author then, like that champion who attacked the late Dr. Gill in the public papers, and defied him " to produce any ſcripture precept, or precedent, for delaying the *Baptiſm of Children*, of chriſtian parents, or for baptizing adult perſons born of ſuch parents; on this, (ſays he,) the controverſy hinges."

The Doctor replies, " It is ridiculous to talk of a precept for delaying that which had never been practiſed. If a warrant is required for baptiſing adult perſons believers, it is ready at hand, and precedents enough! And we know of no precept to baptize any other, let them be born of whom they may; and as for precedents of the baptiſm of adult perſons, born of chriſtian parents, it cannot be expected, nor reaſonably required; ſince the Acts of the Apoſtles only give an account of the planting of the firſt churches, and of the baptiſm of thoſe of whom they firſt conſiſted; and not of thoſe that, in a courſe of years, were added to them. Wherefore to demand inſtances of perſons born of chriſtian parents, and brought up by them, as baptized in adult age, which would require length of time, is unreaſonable; and if the controverſy hinges on this, it ought to be at an end and given up!* And I beg leave to add, that if what Mr. B. has

 advanced

* Gill's Sermon at the Baptiſm of Rev. Robert Carmichael.

advanced upon this head, can be called an argument, I ſhall be glad to know what difference there is between *arguing* and *quibbling*.

Now, Sir, be all attention; here comes another—" Another argument with which we ſupport the rite of Infant Baptiſm, is the well known caſe of *Lydia* and her houſehold." Well, let us ſee of what ſervice her *caſe* will prove to his *cauſe*; " the ſubſtance of which (Lydia's caſe) is,—the Apoſtle preached—Lydia heard—the Lord opened her heart—and ſhe was baptized, and her houſehold; or, as the *Syriac* reads it, *Lydia* and her *children*," (another verſion renders it, *with all her men*; but let Mr. B. take that which ſuits him beſt) " which reading," ſays he, " beſt accounts for the faith of Lydia's houſehold not being mentioned in the above cited paſſage." How ſo? Is it a thing uncommon to ſee parents, whoſe children are of a ſufficient age, to hear and receive the truth for themſelves? It is not neceſſary that the inſpired writers ſhould always mention every minute circumſtance, that attends ſuch a ſubject as this: And had nothing more been ſaid of Lydia than, that ſhe heard, and received the word; I ſhould, without a moment's heſitation, have concluded, (from that happy circumſtance) that ſhe was baptized; Why? becauſe the Apoſtles were commanded to baptize, and did baptize ſuch. Acts ii. And again, agreeable to the ſame mode of reaſoning,

when

when I am informed that they, who conſtituted *Lydia's* houſehold, were baptized, I conclude (upon Scripture authority) they had made a ſimilar profeſſion; Will any aſk why I draw ſuch a concluſion? I anſwer, Becauſe the Apoſtles were not commiſſioned to baptize any without a profeſſion, nor do we ever read that they did. And Mr. B. will find it a hard taſk to prove, that a profeſſion, by proxy, could have entitled any one to baptiſm at that time.

The account Luke gives us of Lydia, and her houſehold, is but ſhort; we are not informed whether ſhe had wholly left her native place (Thyatira) or was only come to reſide at Philippi, for ſome time, to tranſact buſineſs; or whether a maid, a wife, or a widow, we cannot tell: It is not likely, however, that ſhe had a huſband, becauſe ſhe is ſpoken of as the head of a family; nor is it likely that ſhe could carry on buſineſs with a family of Infants. Indeed, from what ſome of our pædobaptiſt brethren have advanced concerning Lydia, ſhe ſeems to have been a very extraordinary Lady; for they allow that a profeſſion of faith was required of adults, but thoſe who conſtituted Lydia's houſehold were baptized on *her* profeſſion of faith only; conſequently it muſt have conſiſted of infants, or little children, who were not capable of hearing, believing, and making a profeſſion of faith for themſelves.

themſelves. I wonder how that Good Woman could manage her buſineſs, and take care of ſuch a family!

" But were we to admit for a moment," ſays Mr. B. " what cannot be proved, that there were no children in Lydia's houſehold, the argument would then remain the ſame. For, ſuppoſe, for inſtance, our Lord had any where ſaid in his word, Wherever you meet with any parents, or heads of families, who acknowledge me to be Chriſt, the Son of God, I command you to baptize them, and their houſeholds." This is the moſt abſurd ſuppoſition I ever met with: How can we ſuppoſe that our bleſſed Lord would contradict himſelf, or command his miniſters to act contrary to the commiſſion he had already given them? " Well, brethren," ſays Mr. B. very gravely, " the example in the paſſage, which is now under conſideration, (viz. the caſe of Lydia) amounts to the very ſame thing; for the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, (who was the head of a family) and ſhe was baptized, and her *houſehold* likewiſe, of *whatſoever* age they might be;" *i. e.* whether young, or old, or middle age; he muſt mean this, or his words can have no meaning at all.

Well, Lydia's houſehold were baptized, of whatſoever age they might be, " and without any

any apparent qualification but that of their being branches of her houſehold." What a fine, eaſy qualification ?—I cannot help thinking of a Gentleman, who, as he was going one day to a place of worſhip, ſtopped in the ſtreet, and aſked his companion to go with him to another meeting, where univerſal ſalvation was preached; his friend wiſhed to know his reaſons; why, ſaid he, I often think they preach a fine, comfortable doctrine, *if it be but true.*

Now, Sir, Mr. B.'s doctrine of apparent qualification might be very ſatisfactory to ſome people, if he could only prove it to be true; but "the caſe of Lydia" will by no means anſwer his purpoſe; for although he takes it for granted, that her *houſehold* were baptized on *her* profeſſion of faith, he can no more prove it, than he can prove that *ſhe* was baptized on *their* profeſſion of faith. The baptiſm of Lydia, and that of her houſehold, together with all the account given of them afterwards, we have recorded in Acts xvi. 15, 40. *And when ſhe was baptized, and her houſehold*; (not a word of her houſehold being baptized on her profeſſion of faith) *ſhe* (ſpeaking in her own perſon as the head, or miſtreſs of the family,) *beſought us, ſaying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my houſe and abide there. And ſhe conſtrained us.—They entered the houſe of Lydia; and when they had ſeen the brethren,*

brethren, they comforted them; and departed. But how this plain account ſerves in the leaſt to ſupport the " Rite of Infant Baptiſm," I have not yet been able to learn.

Our author, however, is determined that Lydia *ſhall* ſupport this rite at any rate. " It is in vain, ſays he, for any one to ſay, *we cannot prove that Lydia had any children,* for we do not want to prove that," (very likely not, for obvious reaſons) " all that we have to prove is;" (What?) " That children (where there are any) make a part of the houſehold," wiſely and cautiouſly ſaid, " and when this is done our way is plain before us." But however plain, Sir, it may appear to him, you will ſoon find, that it is not the King's high road.

" Therefore, Brethren," ſays Mr. B. " as children (I ſuppoſe he ſtill means where there are any) do make part of a houſehold, and as (from the Apoſtle's example) we are to baptize all the houſehold, on the profeſſion of the parents, or head of ſuch houſehold; then it muſt neceſſarily follow."—Softly, Sir; the concluſion is premature,—the premiſes are by no means ſafe.—I muſt again call for a proof, that any of the Apoſtles ever did baptize any *one*, on the profeſſion of *another*; I am ſure there is no intimation of that kind in the caſe of Lydia and her family,

family, any more than there is in the caſe of ſeveral families, with whom I am now acquainted, who have been baptized upon profeſſion of faith. Indeed, I have at times wondered, conſidering the ſucceſs with which the Goſpel was attended in the Apoſtle's days, (notwithſtanding the oppoſition it met with) that during the ſpace of about thirty-one years, we read of no more than Two or Three whole families being converted to the faith. Perhaps there might be many more than we have recorded in Divine Revelation; but had there been twenty houſeholds mentioned, it would not have altered the caſe. No, Sir, it does not "neceſſarily follow," as Mr. B. aſſerts, "that either children *muſt be baptized*, or rejected as being no part of the houſehold or family." He is greatly miſtaken; the reaſon why we do not baptize them, is, we have no Scripture warrant for doing ſo; and as to rejecting them, as being no part of the family, ſuch an inſinuation is not worthy of notice. He then adds, with an air of triumph, "*If* the Apoſtle did right in baptizing Lydia's houſehold, on her profeſſion of faith only, I have done right in baptizing this child,—our way is *plain* before us." Then, what a pity that he ſhould thus grope in the dark! if he can really *ſuppoſe* that Lydia's profeſſion of faith was of ſuch an extraordinary nature as to qualify all her domeſtics, of *whatſoever* age they might be,

for baptiſm; he ought, in the height of his zeal, to have conſidered, that ſuch a *ſuppoſition* is too weak to ſupport an argument. To ſay that he has " herein," (i. e.) in baptizing Mr. Feiſt's child, " followed a plain Scripture example," is trifling with the Word of God, as it is not in his power to produce a Scripture (much leſs a plain Scripture) example for ſuch a practice.

And yet he informs us, that not to baptize our children, is equally as unſcriptural and unwarrantable, as it would be " to exclude them from our families," nay, he declares (and who dare diſpute his word?) that either they " *muſt* be baptized, or rejected as making no part of the houſehold or family." I confeſs this method of arguing appears to me ſo mighty ſtrong, and clear, that a child of three or four years old can ſcarcely evade the force of it! for I believe there are few children, even at that age, who would not ſubmit to be baptized, (or at leaſt ſprinkled) rather than be rejected, or excluded from the family.

But I would beg leave to inform Mr. B. that although the word of God knows nothing of the initiating rite of Infant Baptiſm, yet we are by no means diſpoſed to reject or exclude our offſpring; no, Sir, we commit them to God, we continue to pray for them; we wiſh to inſtruct them,

them, as ſoon as they are capable of receiving inſtruction, and to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; to ſet before them a good example, and neither reject them, exclude them from, nor deprive them of, any religious privilege they can poſſibly enjoy.

Let us now ſee how Mr. B. ſums up the argument from the caſe of Lydia. "And here, Brethren, we may ſee how the Apoſtles underſtood their *commiſſion*; they were to require of ADULTS, a profeſſion of their faith in Chriſt, before they were initiated by baptiſm—as the caſe of *Lydia* ſhows; but were to baptize or initiate their families, IF NOT ADULTS, without that profeſſion, as appears by the caſe of her houſehold."

You ſee, Sir, now the ſcene is changed; Mr. B. after having condeſcended to admit, for a moment, that there were no children in Lydia's houſehold, and after having aſſured us, he did not want to prove that Lydia had any children, very ſedately calls our attention to a houſehold of little children, and leaves the argument to ſink in the ſuppoſition, not only tha Lydia *had* children, but that her family conſiſted of *none* but ſuch; for he affirms, that a profeſſion of faith was required of adults, and that none but children were baptized without that profeſſion—as appears by the caſe of Lydia's houſe-

hold. What then (in the name of logic) is there, after all, in the caſe of Lydia, to ſupport his argument, except the *mere ſuppoſition* that her houſehold conſiſted of none but children?

I believe, that if (before I had peruſed Mr. B.'s pamphlet) I had heard any *ſtranger*, arguing for Infant Baptiſm, juſt as our author does from the caſe of *Lydia*, I ſhould have thought he muſt have had a deſign to ridicule the practice he pretended to plead for.

Mr. B. adds, "And had we no other example of the caſe of houſeholds, in all the New Teſtament, this is ſufficient to juſtify our practice." Whether it is, or not, I ſhall leave others to determine.* With reſpect to the other paſſages, which inform us of houſeholds being baptized, let them be carefully peruſed by ſuch as deſire to know the will of God, as revealed in his word. Houſeholds, or families, who are introduced to our attention in ſuch a point of view, as almoſt to preclude the neceſſity of mentioning any thing relative to their baptiſm. When I read (Acts xvi. 32, 34.) that *Paul* and *Silas* ſpake unto the Jailor, the word of the Lord, *and to all that were in his houſe*,—and that *he rejoiced, believing in God with all his houſe*; and (Acts xviii. 8.) Criſpus, the

* Rom. ii. 17—24. which Mr. B. refers to, has nothing to do with Baptiſm; I therefore paſs it by.

the chief ruler of the Synagogue, believing on the Lord, *with all his houſe*; and the *houſehold of Stephanas*, (1 Cor. i. 16.) *who addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints*, (1 Cor. xvi. 15.) I ſay, when I read of *all theſe* houſeholds, or families, I conſider them all as proper *ſubjects* of *baptiſm*.*

I perfectly agree with the following aſſertion of our author, which I therefore inſert in capitals; "WERE HUMAN AUTHORITY ADMITTED TO HAVE ANY WEIGHT ON THIS SUBJECT, WE COULD PRODUCE IT."

I congratulate Mr. *Barnard* upon his ſafe arrival at that only ground, on which the rite of Infant Baptiſm ſtands, and by which it *has* been, and now *is*, ſo powerfully ſupported.

That "the learned *Wall* took great pains in this enquiry," will be readily granted; and if great pains to ranſack the rubbiſh of antiquity, in ſearch of a practice, never once mentioned in Scripture,

* I can ſcarcely help ſmiling at the *reveries* of another warm advocate for the *rite* of Infant Baptiſm, who, in a Book entitled, *The Principal Subjects of Chriſtianity*, p. 198, talks of *initiating* Infants into the viſible Church, and *conſecrating* them; and as to the abovementioned families, he is morally *certain* that infants *muſt* have been included. Surely they muſt have been very Wonderful Infants! the word of the Lord was ſpoken to them; they *believed, rejoiced in God*, and *addicted themſelves to the miniſtry of the Saints*. I know of no Baptiſt Miniſter that would refuſe to baptize *ſuch infants*. This ſame PROTESTANT DISSENTER ſpeaks of, and inſtructs *Godfathers*, and *Godmothers!*

Scripture, merits a *Diploma*, Mr. *Wall* well deſerved the degree of D. D. which was ſoon after conferred upon him. He has been ſufficiently anſwered by Dr. *Gale*, and many others, ſo far as the Baptiſts are concerned.

The *ſtale* anecdote concerning *Auſtin*, and *Pelagius*, proves no more than, that Infant Baptiſm was practiſed in the fourth or fifth century. I believe it was practiſed before *Auſtin* the *Monk* (or, as Mr. B. calls him, St. Auſtin) was born. But if the authority of Auſtin be admitted to have any weight upon the ſubject of baptiſm, why not, in reference to the *mode* of adminiſtring it, which was by immerſion? And did not *Auſtin* maintain Infant Communion, the Sign of the Croſs, the form of renouncing the Devil, anointing with oil in baptiſm, and giving a mixture of milk and honey to the baptized? Will *his* authority be admitted by Mr. B. to have any weight in theſe things? I preſume not.

The next "human authority" produced, is, that of St. *Ambroſe*, who was conſecrated Archbiſhop of *Milan*, in the year 374. If that good man believed that "the Baptiſm of Infants was the practice of the Apoſtles, &c." it ſeems evident, from his own words, that he *himſelf* baptized upon *catechetic* inſtruction,* and that he adminiſtered baptiſm by trine immerſion. Theſe are

* Rees's Anſwer to Walker.

are his words, †" Thou waſt aſked, Doſt thou " believe in God the Father Almighty? Thou " ſaidſt, I do believe, and waſt dipped, that is, " thou waſt buried. Thou waſt aſked again, " Doſt thou believe on our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, " and his crucifixion? Thou ſaidſt, I believe, " and waſt dipped again, and ſo buried with " Chriſt. Thou waſt aſked the third time, Doſt " thou alſo believe in the *Holy Spirit?* Thou " anſweredſt, I believe, and waſt dipped the " third time." This Good Biſhop (I ſhould have ſaid this Ancient Father) thought the above, no doubt, to be according to the Apoſtolic plan; but whether the authority of St. *Ambroſe*, be admitted to have any weight with Mr. B. or not, I ſhall leave others to determine.

The next is *Cyprian*:—This ancient Father of the Church, whoſe " authority" has often been " produced" on this ſubject, was a native of *Carthage*, and one of the richeſt and firſt families of that city; we are informed that he taught Rhetoric there with reputation,* but was not ſo much as converted to Chriſtianity, till within three or four years of the time Mr. B. refers to, when

† Interrogátus es, credis in Deum patrem omnipotentem, dixiſti credo, & merſiſti, hoc eſt, ſepultus es, &c. *Ambroſ. de Sacrament. lib. 2. cap. 7.*

* Fleoyd's Bibliotheca Biographica. *Art. Cyprian.*

when " a queſtion was ſtarted by *Fidus*, (who was a Biſhop) Whether the baptiſm of Infants ſhould be deferred till the *eighth day*, the old time of circumciſion? upon which a council of ſixty ſix Biſhops was called!" Really, Sir, all that buſtle appears to me ſufficient to convince any one, that *Infant Baptiſm* was then in its *infant ſtate*.*

He tells us, that " *Origen*, and St. *Auſtin* ſpoke of baptiſm, as adminiſtered for a *wrong purpoſe*;" is it then any wonder that they ſhould adminiſter it to *wrong* ſubjects? " *Tertullian*," ſays he, " it is true, who lived at the ſame time, ſpoke againſt Infant Baptiſm," and ſo have I, in this long letter, more than was at firſt intended; but being juſt now called to engage in a more important work, I ſhall at preſent ſay no more than, that

I am,

Sir,

Your's, &c.

W. P.

LETTER

* Cyprian pleaded as ſtrenuouſly for Infant-communion, as he did for Infant Baptiſm; why ſhould his " authority" have no " weight" with Mr. B.?

LETTER II.

DEAR SIR,

WE proceed now to the mode of baptiſm, or "the manner how it ought to be adminiſtered.—What we differ about," ſays Mr. B. "is, Whether the *water* is to be applied to the *ſubject*, or the *ſubject* to the water.* If we attend to the original word *baptizo*, as it is explained by ſome, they tell us, that it ſignifies invariably to *dip*, *plunge*, or *waſh*." (I believe very few will pretend to affirm that it ever ſignifies to *ſprinkle*:) "But they will take care to inform us, that there is no waſhing without dipping." Here he refers to what the late Dr. *Gill*, and the learned *Grotius* obſerve, concerning the divers *waſhings*, *bathings*, or *baptiſms* of the Jews; called *divers*, becauſe of the different perſons and things waſhed or dipped, and not becauſe of different ſorts of waſhings, for there is but one way of waſhing, and that is by dipping. What has a little water only ſprinkled or poured on it, cannot be ſaid to be waſhed; the Jews had their ſprinklings, which

* Rather whether the ſubject is to be *immerſed* or *ſprinkled*.

were distinct from washings or bathings, and were always performed by immersion? I leave it for Mr. B. to prove, that persons were washed from *ceremonial pollutions* (to which Dr. Gill alludes) by any mode short of immersion.

Our author, in order to prove "that the word *baptize* cannot be restrained in its signification, to dip, or plunge, only," calls our attention to *experience* and *scripture*.

"First, Let us attend to experience," says Mr. B. "and a *child of a moderate capacity*;" (You see, Sir, How he condescends to instruct us!) This "Child, of a moderate capacity, will tell us, that when he washes his face, he does not dip it in, but applies the water to it. Ask the same child how his mother washes the floor of her house, and," wonderful! "he will be able to inform you, that she does not dip it into the water, but applies the water to it. Ask him moreover, how the walls or ceiling of a room is white-washed, and there is no doubt but he will tell you as before, not by dipping them into the liquor, but by applying the liquor to them, and, by these answers, will prove to you, that there is such a thing as *washing, without dipping*."

But what (in the name of common sense) have these puerile interrogations and answers to

do

do with the Jewiſh ceremonial waſhings, which Dr. *Gill* and *Grotius* ſpeak of?* Or what have they to do with our author's mode of *ſprinkling*? He ſays, p. 14, that "the etymological, or grammatical meaning of the original word, for *baptize* is *primarily* to *waſh*,—or *bring into a ſtate of wetneſs*, and in a ſecondary ſenſe to *dip*, *pour on*, or *ſprinkle*, as ſo many modes of bringing about the primary deſign;" but, I believe, it would be difficult to find "*a child of a moderate capacity*," furniſhed with a ſufficient degree of aſſurance to affirm, that ſo much as his *face*, was *waſhed* or *brought into a ſtate of wetneſs*, by a few drops of water, ſprinkled on his forehead; and was the ſame child to tell us that his mother *waſhes* the floor of her houſe, by *ſprinkling* or *pouring* a little water on a *part* of it, or that the walls and ceiling of a room are white-waſhed by *ſprinkling*, or *pouring* a little of the liquor on a ſmall part of them, we ſhould conſider him as an *Ideot*, rather than a child of *moderate capacity*.

"But, Secondly," ſays Mr. B. "let us attend to the Scripture upon this head, and if *baptize* invariably means, to plunge, or dip, either of them may be ſubſtituted, with equal propriety, in its room, without deſtroying the ſenſe of the paſſages of ſcripture wherein it occurs;

* Mr. B. refers to Dr. Gill's Body of Divinity. vol. 3. p. 335.

let us attend to the following ſcriptures, uſing the word *plunge*, inſtead of *baptize*, &c."

" John did *plunge* in the wilderneſs, and preached the *plunging* of repentance;" they were *plunged* of him in the river Jordan. Mr. B. repreſents ſuch language as *indecent* and *improper*; but you know, Sir, we are expreſsly told (Mark i. 5.) that John *baptized* the people IN *the river of Jordan*:—How? Muſt we ſay, in order to have *decent* and *proper* language, that John *ſprinkled* them IN THE RIVER! and as Mr. B. calls baptiſm a " *ceremonial purification*," he ought to remember, that the law of purification, particularly, required *bathing* or *immerſion*, which, in my opinion, is not very different from *plunging*.

Another paſſage he introduces, is, Mark i. 8. "I indeed have *plunged* you with water."—He could not well have *plunged* them without water, for John's was water baptiſm; his words are, *I indeed have baptized you* (εν υδατι) *in water*, and I think it does not require a very extraordinary *capacity* to find out, which is the moſt proper language; whether to ſay, John *plunged*, *dipped*, or *immerſed* them *in water*; or to ſay, he *ſprinkled* them *in water!* The meaning of the latter part of the verſe will be conſidered in another place.

The next paſſage he brings, contains part of our Saviour's words to two of his Diſciples.

Mark

Mark x. 38, 39. *Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptiſm that I am baptized with?—Ye ſhall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of, and with the baptiſm that I am baptized withal, ſhall ye be baptized.* I need not inform you, Sir, that our Saviour refers to his ſufferings; ſuch ſufferings as were prophetically repreſented by the idea of *coming into deep waters, where the floods overflowed him.* Pſalm lxix. 2. Yes, our Bleſſed Redeemer, who came to ſuffer, bleed, and die for ſinners, was (not ſprinkled, but) *plunged, overwhelmed,* or *immerſed* in ſufferings, in alluſion to which, he, with great propriety, makes uſe of the term *baptiſm,* the meaning of which was not then perverted, either in its "primary ſenſe," or the "mode of bringing about that deſign."

The Diſciples alſo, to whom our Lord addreſſed himſelf, were baptized, plunged, or immerſed in ſufferings; and thus, Sir, the above paſſages ſerve to eſtabliſh that, which Mr. B. labours to ridicule, by uſing the words *plunging,* and *plunged,* inſtead of *baptizing* and *baptized.*

Our author introduces a few more paſſages, with the ſame ſucceſs, ſtill amuſing his readers with the words *plunging,* and *plunged*; but as they anſwer his purpoſe no better than thoſe I have already noticed, I ſhall paſs them by; only

we

we muſt not overlook the following important obſervation, to which he has annexed a double note of admiration. His words are, " and if the terms *baptize*, and *plunge*, be ſynonymous; then the doctrine of *Baptiſms*, in the Hebrews, may be read the doctrine of *Plungings!!*" Why not? Is it not well known that the Jewiſh *bathings*, or *immerſions*, and the occaſions of them, were very numerous? (and the Apoſtle, in the ſame Epiſtle, ſufficiently proves that ſuch waſhings had a doctrine in them.) The Hebrews had been accuſtomed to them; there is no reaſon, therefore, to ſuppoſe, that they would be ſo thunderſtruck as ſome people appear to be now, with the ſound of ſuch words as *immerſions*, *bathings*, or *plungings*.

" From theſe," ſays our author, " and many more paſſages of Scripture that might be produced; it evidently appears, that the words *baptize*, and *plunge*, cannot be terms of the ſame *meaning*;" I wiſh he was a little more deliberate in drawing concluſions; for, as yet, he has not ſo much as attempted to explain the different ſignifications of the terms. " And," ſays he, " were we to ſupply the original word with *dip*," (pray what difference is there between *dip*, and *plunge?*) but were we to uſe the word " *ſprinkle*, the ſame abſurdities would follow of courſe." No, Sir, the *ſame* abſurdities cannot follow; for

if

if it be thought abſurd, to ſay that John *plunged, dipped,* or *immerſed* the people IN THE RIVER JORDAN; I am perſuaded Mr. B. himſelf would, upon any other occaſion, think it *much more* abſurd to ſay, that he *ſprinkled* them IN that river. He intimates, that either to "*plunge, dip,* or *ſprinkle,* may be a *mode,* by which the ſubject may be brought into a baptized ſtate." If ſo, we, however, cannot be *wrong,* whilſt we are under the neceſſity of declaring it to be our opinion, that he cannot be *right;* except he can prove that dipping, and ſprinkling, are ſynonymous terms: They are always mentioned in the bible as two diſtinct acts.

"Now, Brethren," ſays Mr. B. "you have to obſerve, that BAPTISM is a *general term,* which includes divers modes of application." If he mean the adminiſtration of water baptiſm, by a Miniſter of Chriſt, what occaſion is there for *divers* modes of application? "And beſides the *etymological,* or *grammatical* meaning, it has a *ſacramental* meaning, which is generally overlooked by writers on this ſubject." But is there any ſacramental meaning "generally overlooked," that tends, in the leaſt, to deſtroy the plain, grammatical meaning of the word itſelf?" Our *eating* and *drinking* at the Lord's table, have what he calls a ſacramental meaning; yet, I ſuppoſe, he will allow, that ſo much bread and wine ſhould be uſed in that ſacred ordinance, that

that we may be ſaid to *eat* and *drink*, according to the plain, literal, or (if he pleaſe) the *etymological* or *grammatical* meaning of the words.

" The ſacramental meaning of the term Baptiſm, ſeems"—here, again, our author having loſt ſight of the plain ſcripture rule, is obliged to trudge on cautiouſly, and carefully, without a lamp to his feet, or a light to his path; and when this is the caſe with any of us, you know, Sir, that objects SEEM often different from what they are in reality.

" The *ſacramental* meaning of the term Baptiſm, *ſeems* to include PURIFICATION, *dedication*, *conſecration*, *ſeparation*, or *initiation*, and the like." So the " ſacramental meaning of the term Baptiſm," *ſeems* to include a number of *Jewiſh ceremonial rites!* and there *ſeems* to be more ſtill included; for he puts us off with ſomething like an *et cætera*. Why he thought proper to mention juſt *Five*, and no more, I cannot pretend to ſay, except he intended to put us in mind of our Five Senſes.

Now we " have to obſerve," that the *ſacramental* meaning of baptiſm includes, or rather, as Mr. B. expreſſes it, " *ſeems* to include" the above five things, " and the like, according to the connexion in which it ſtands." If he means, *according to the connexion* in which baptiſm ſtands;

he

he ſhould have told us how many different ſorts of connexions it ſtands in:—If he means *according to the connexion* in which either *purification*, *dedication*, *conſecration*, *ſeparation*, or *initiation* ſtands, he ought, at leaſt, to have referred us to ſome paſſage, where any of them ſtand at all in connexion with the ordinance of *baptiſm*. We will not allow him to put in the word *purify*, or *dedicate*, or *conſecrate*, or "the like," himſelf; nor are our bibles provided with blanks for that purpoſe. And ſome of us, who have not Mr. B.'s penetration, might often commit errors, in fixing upon theſe ſacramental connexions, by blunderingly inſerting, perhaps (for inſtance) *ceremonial purification*, where it ſhould be ceremonial *conſecration*; a miſtake, certainly, of no ſmall conſequence, as the law of *purification*, and that of *conſecration*, were different, and intended by the great Lawgiver for different purpoſes; but both, it SEEMS, are included in the *ſacramental* meaning of the term Baptiſm, if we have only wiſdom enough to find out the connexion. Similar blunders might be committed by confounding *ſeparation* with *initiation*, and either of them with *dedication*, "and the like."

Mr. B. now returns to "the *etymological*, or *grammatical* meaning of the original word for baptize;" and what is it? It is primarily to *waſh*, *tinge*, *ſtain*, *dye*, or *bring into a ſtate of wet-*

neſs;

neſs; and in a ſecondary ſenſe, to *dip*, *pour on*, or *ſprinkle*, as ſo many *modes* of bringing about the *primary* deſign." But I believe he would ſmile at the very idea of *ſprinkling* in any other caſe, as a *mode* of bringing about ſuch a *primary* deſign. "This," ſays he, "is proved at large, by Mr. Williams, in conjunction with many more of the moſt able critics, in his Antipædobaptiſm examined; to which I refer the reader." I ſincerely reſpect Dr. Williams as a Chriſtian, and a Miniſter, and have peruſed his two volumes referred to, and have no objection that any of my friends ſhould do the ſame; but with reſpect to goſpel ordinances, I muſt beg leave to refer my reader to an old book, written about ſeventeen hundred years ago, which ſtill bears the title of THE NEW TESTAMENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.

Our author introduces a *quotation* from Dr. *Owen*, which, in my opinion, is no way favourable to the cauſe of ſprinkling. The Doctor obſerves, "that no inſtance can be given in ſcripture wherein Βαπτιζω doth neceſſarily ſignify to *dip*, or *plunge*,—and that it no where ſignifies to *dip*, but as a MODE of, and in order to *waſhing*, *wetting*, or *dying*." Be it ſo, that it ſignifies to *dip*, as a *mode*, is ſurely ſufficient to juſtify our practice, in adminiſtring baptiſm by the *mode* of dipping.

"And

" And even *Medley, Stannett* (I ſuppoſe he means the preſent Dr. Stennett) and Dr. *Gale*, all of them Baptiſt Miniſters, are forced to acknowledge, that the word *baptize*, does not neceſſarily imply a total *immerſion*, or dipping." But why ſhould he introduce the names of *Medley* and *Stennett*, in ſo *reſpectful* a manner, without ſo much as informing us, where we are to meet with thoſe *forced* acknowledgements? how, when, by whom, and to whom they were *forced* to acknowledge, &c.

And when was Dr. *Gale* (when ſpeaking of the ordinance of baptiſm) *forced* to acknowledge that the word Βαπτιζω does not neceſſarily imply a total immerſion? His own words, as quoted by Mr. B. expreſs a total immerſion in the ſtrongeſt terms. " The word Βαπτιζω (ſays Dr. " Gale) perhaps, does not ſo neceſſarily expreſs " the action of putting *under water*, as in gene- " ral a thing's being in *that condition*, no matter " how it comes ſo, whether it is put *into the* " *water*, or the *water comes over it*." All this is perfectly right, but how a thing can be brought into a condition of being *under water*, ſo, that the *water comes over it*, without *neceſſarily implying a total immerſion*, is far beyond my comprehenſion.

" According to this Gentleman's (Dr. Gale's) opinion, *baptiſm*," ſays Mr. B. " may be as well

performed, by applying water to the ſubject, as it can be by applying the ſubject to the water;" and how witty the following compariſon! "juſt the ſame as if a man wanted to have his body brought into a *refreſhed ſtate*. This may be done either by applying the food to his mouth, or his mouth to the food; though the former ſeems to be the moſt natural way of bringing about the primary deſign, which is to *refreſh his body*." What a marvellous illuſtration of water baptiſm!

Dr. Gale mentions the word Βαπτιζεϑαι, as being uſed "to ſignify, the land was *under water*, by the water's coming in *upon it*; but (ſays the Doctor) it will be found of no advantage to our adverſaries, if it be obſerved, that it here *neceſſarily* and *unavoidably* imports to be *under* water, or to be *overwhelmed*, or *covered* with water; which no way ſuits our *Engliſh* Pædobaptiſts, but is very agreeable with what the Antipædobaptiſts, and the whole *Greek* Church (which one would imagine ſhould underſtand the force of the word) at this day continue to practice." And I am perſuaded, "a *child of a moderate capacity*" will never think it the moſt proper and expeditious way to put any thing in a condition of being *under* water, by applying the water to it; except it be ſomething immoveable like the floors, walls, or ceilings of our houſes, the waſhing of which has been ſo ingeniouſly deſcribed!

But

But Mr. B. ſays, " If a perſon want to be brought into a baptized ſtate, or a ſtate of *legal* PURIFICATION, *conſecration*, &c. &c. This, as Dr. Gale *juſtly* obſerves."—here, again, I muſt be ſo rude as to interrupt him, by ſaying, that Dr. G. does not obſerve any thing either *juſtly* or *unjuſtly*, that will bear the moſt remote conſtruction in favor of our author's mode of baptizing, " This" ſays Mr. B. " may be done either by applying the ſubject to the water, or the water to the ſubject, though the latter to us appears the moſt natural mode." It appeared quite the reverſe to Dr. Gale, but it appears, ſays our author, moſt agreeable to the Word of God.

Now, Sir, as he refers to ſcripture, let us be attentive; and as he takes it for granted, that baptiſm is a *legal*, or *ceremonial purification*, &c. &c. it is no wonder he ſhould go to the ceremonial law for directions reſpecting the *mode* of adminiſtering it. He refers us firſt to the 14th chapter of Leviticus, where we have an account of the *rites* and *ſacrifices* made uſe of in cleanſing the *leper*; they were to take two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood, and ſcarlet, and hyſſop: one of the birds was to be killed in an earthen veſſel, over running water; the cedar wood, the ſcarlet, the hyſſop, and the living bird, were to be dipped in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water—this compoſition of blood and water, was to be ſprinkled upon the

the leper ſeven times—the leper was to waſh his clothes—ſhave off all his hair, and waſh himſelf in water, &c. but I am not able to diſcover what theſe things have to do with either the *ſacramental*, or *grammatical* meaning of baptiſm.

Our author quotes likewiſe the 19th chapter of NUMBERS, where the water of ſeparation is mentioned, the manner of preparing, and the uſe of it, for *purification* of *ceremonial* uncleanneſs. A red heifer, without ſpot or blemiſh, was brought before the prieſt—he was to bring her forth without the camp—ſhe was there to be ſlain before his face—the prieſt was to take of her blood with his finger—ſprinkle of her blood directly before the tabernacle ſeven times—the heifer to be burnt in his ſight, &c.—cedar wood, hyſſop, and ſcarlet, to be caſt into the midſt of the burning—the prieſt then to waſh his clothes, and bathe himſelf in water—come into the camp—be unclean until the even; and he who burnt her was to *waſh his clothes* in water—*bathe his fleſh* in water, and be unclean until the even. The water of ſeparation, prepared as above, was to be ſprinkled upon the unclean—upon the tent—upon the veſſels, &c. &c. Repeated *waſhings* of clothes, and *bathings* in water, are mentioned. I think that to accommodate ſuch paſſages to Mr. B.'s purpoſe, requires more than "a moderate capacity." He refers to *one* paſſage in the New Teſtament, namely, Acts x.

44. in which we have not a word concerning water baptiſm; but that paſſage will come by and by under conſideration.

" Now" ſays our author, " if we adhere to the ſacramental meaning of the word *baptizo*, which is *ceremonially* to *purify*, *conſecrate*, *ſeparate*, *dedicate*, or *initiate*, according to its connexion, we ſhall then have decent and proper language all through the Bible." So that ſuch phraſes as *ceremonial purification*, *conſecration*, &c. when applied to a plain goſpel ordinance, are calculated to embelliſh the language of the New Teſtament, or to render it more decent and proper!

" Thus, for inſtance, John ſays, I indeed have *baptized*, (that is *purified*," and ſome might put in *conſecrated*, *ſeparated*, *dedicated*, or *initiated*) " you with water." And might not the Eunuch have ſaid, *See here is water, what doth hinder me to be ceremonially conſecrated?* Mr. B. makes him ſay, " What doth hinder me to be *ceremonially* " *initiated* into the goſpel diſpenſation*—He that " believeth and is *conſecrated*, ſhall be ſaved.— " Go ye and teach all nations, *conſecrating* them, " &c." Thus he embelliſheth the language of the New Teſtament!

The

* QUERE. Was not the Eunuch under the *Goſpel diſpenſation*, while Philip was preaching Chriſt to him?

The Apoſtle Paul, on the other hand, guards the churches, and particularly the Hebrews, againſt ceremonial purifications; and *Peter* agrees with *Paul*, by informing the Jewiſh converts, that baptiſm is *not* a ceremonial purification, or the putting away the filth of the fleſh, but *the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God.* But our author (in direct oppoſition to both) ſays, " Therefore if we conſider a ſtate of *legal* (or ceremonial) *purification, conſecration, ſeparation,* &c. to be a ſtate of baptiſm—the difficulties and improprieties will then vaniſh away." No, Sir, both the difficulties and improprieties increaſe abundantly:—How can they " vaniſh away?" or how can we ſee " our way plain before us?" while he continues to divert our attention, by preſenting to our view the water of ſeparation, prepared with the ſkin, fleſh, and blood of a red heifer, cedar wood, hyſſop, and ſcarlet.—A man dying in a tent—every thing in that tent unclean for ſeven days—ſprinkling the tent, the veſſels, and the perſons, with the water of ſeparation—waſhing their clothes, bathing in water, and a great variety of other circumſtances, mentioned in the law of *purification,* (to ſay nothing of the law of *conſecration,* &c.) how can the " difficulties vaniſh?" One text of ſcripture appears to me, however, ſufficient to remove all the *difficulties* and *improprieties* which Mr. B. has thrown in our way:—We are told, Acts x. 28. that God had

had ſhewed Peter, that he ſhould not (now under the Goſpel diſpenſation) call *any man common* or (ceremonially) *unclean*; and where there is no *ceremonial pollution*, it is folly to talk of ceremonial purification.

" But let us proceed now" ſays Mr. B. " to examine ſome of thoſe paſſages of ſcripture which are thought to favour the idea of *dipping* or *plunging*. We will begin with our Lord's baptiſm, by John, which *ſome* think to be a very ſtriking proof of *adult* baptiſm by *plunging*." I believe, it will not be thought by *many* to be a very ſtriking proof of *Infant* baptiſm by *ſprinkling*. " The ſubſtance of the relation is—Jeſus came to John to be baptized—John modeſtly forbade him—Jeſus ſaid, Suffer it to be ſo now, for thus it becometh us (PRIESTS) to fulfil all righteouſneſs." So, according to our author's gloſs upon this paſſage, both our Saviour and John were *Prieſts*, after the order of Aaron! I will not be ſo ungenerous as to demand a ſcripture proof of this, becauſe I know it is not in his power to produce one; but as he undertakes to give us the *true meaning* of this part of God's word, you ſhall have the whole paragraph at large, leſt he ſhould ſay I have miſrepreſented his meaning.

" Now" ſays he, " in order to underſtand the

" true meaning of this part of God's word, you
" have to conſider what this *Righteouſneſs* is, to
" which our Lord alludes; and you will find it
" to be the righteouſneſs, not of the *moral*, but
" of the *ceremonial* law, and eſpecially that part
" of it which required the prieſt to be *thirty*
" *years of age*, and that he ſhould be *waſhed*
" *with water*, before he entered upon that office.
" So that the plain fact is, when Jeſus began to
" be about *thirty* years of age, and was going to
" enter upon his *public miniſtry*, and knowing
" that the *ceremonial law required that the prieſt*
" *ſhould be waſhed with water*, he went to John,
" and requeſted him *to perform that ceremony*; and
" upon John's objecting to it, Jeſus ſaid, Suffer
" it to be ſo now; for thus it becometh us to
" fulfil all righteouſneſs; and if Chriſt did not
" at this time fulfil this part of the *ceremonial* law,
" we ſhould be glad to know when he did."

I am heartily ſorry that a MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL ſhould thus depreciate the *prieſtly* office of our bleſſed Lord, by repreſenting him as a Jewiſh prieſt, according to the *ceremonial law*. *That law* " required that the prieſts ſhould be waſhed with water,—and if Chriſt did not at this time" (i. e. when he was baptized) " fulfil this part of the *ceremonial* law, we ſhould be glad" ſays Mr. B. " to know when he did." To which I anſwer, he never did; he never could,

could, conſiſtent with the dignity of his character; he never was deſigned, to be a *prieſt after the order of Aaron*; nor could John baptize, or waſh him, with a view to prepare him for the prieſt's office, (according to the law of conſecration in Lev. viii. which Mr. B. refers to) without being guilty of a violent *breach* of the *ceremonial* law, which allowed none to ſuſtain that office, but ſuch as were of the tribe of Levi, and but a few of that tribe. Our Saviour, who was of the tribe of Juda, never officiated as a prieſt, according to the ceremonial law; and had it been his intention to do ſo, when he came to John, he muſt have ſaid, *Thus it becometh us to aboliſh this part of the ceremonial law.* Our author, before he had undertaken to give us the *true meaning* of Matt. iii. 13—15. ought to have read the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, with more attention than he appears to have done. The Apoſtle ſpeaks of Chriſt as a prieſt, who was not to *be called after the order of Aaron:* For the prieſthood being changed, there is made, of neceſſity, a change alſo of the law. For he of whom theſe things are ſpoken, *pertaineth to another tribe,* of which no men gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord ſprang out of Juda, *of which tribe Moſes ſpake nothing concerning prieſthood.* And it is yet more evident: for that after the *ſimiliſude of Melchiſedec,* there ariſeth *another prieſt.* Who is made, *not*

after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endleſs life. For he teſtifieth, Thou art a prieſt for ever *after the order of Melchiſedec.* See Heb. vii. 11—17.

" John's Baptiſm" (ſays our author) " was no Chriſtian ordinance." It was, however, an ordinance, which Chriſt himſelf ſubmitted to, when he came to give us an example that we might follow his ſteps; it was an ordinance which John never adminiſtered to any, without firſt preaching to them repentance, and faith on him that ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus; and John's baptiſm is repreſented by the Evangeliſt Mark, chap. i. 1, &c. as *the beginning* (or firſt introduction) *of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God. As it is written in the Prophets, Behold I ſend my meſſenger before thy face, which ſhall prepare thy way before thee*——This meſſenger baptized. And Mr. B. is greatly miſtaken in ſuppoſing, that they who had been baptized by John, were afterwards baptized by Paul, or any of the Apoſtles. The *certain Diſciples* mentioned, Acts xix. 1—5. were not baptized the *ſecond* time; Paul, we are told, ſaid unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghoſt ſince ye believed? By the Holy Ghoſt he means the extraordinary gifts of the ſpirit, as appears evident from the 6th verſe; of ſuch an actual out-pouring of the Holy Ghoſt they had not heard, till Paul addreſſed them, ver. 2. Paul having been informed

that

that they were baptized perſons, interrogated them, ver. 3. Unto what were ye baptized? they ſaid, Unto John's baptiſm. The 4th and 5th verſes contain the words of Paul, giving an account of John's baptiſm, and ſhewing that it was adminiſtered in the name of the Lord Jeſus. *John baptized with the baptiſm of repentance, ſaying unto the people, that they ſhould believe on him which ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus. When they* (who attended John's miniſtry) *heard this, they were baptized* (by John) *in the name of the Lord Jeſus.* John preached *repentance* and *faith* (in him that ſhould come after him,) and *both* as pre-requiſites to baptiſm; his baptiſm, then, and the Chriſtian baptiſm, are the very ſame in ſubſtance, the latter being no more than a continuation of the former. Mr. B. ſays, that "could a thouſand examples of John's baptizing by immerſion be produced, they would be of no uſe in eſtabliſhing that mode of baptizing." Pitiful triumph! thus to pour contempt on a mode ſanctioned by the example of the great Head of the Church!

The next paragraph, which introduces "that remarkable circumſtance related in the Acts of the Apoſtles, (chap. ii.) where we are informed, that they who gladly received the word were baptized," deſerves no notice till Mr. B. prove his aſſertions. "There appears" ſays he, "not the

the leaſt probability of their being dipped"— but why? "they were not provided with proper garments." How came he to know that? "We are *told* of but *twelve men* to baptize *three thouſand* people." I ſhould be glad to know who *told* him ſo. "All this was performed in *one day only*." This is more than Mr. B. can prove: if there were about three thouſand ſouls added to the Church in one day, that will, by no means, prove that they were all baptized in one day; but ſuppoſe they were, you know, Sir, the *Seventy Diſciples* were qualified for baptizing, as well as the *twelve Apoſtles*; they could eaſily have baptized more than double the number mentioned, in leſs than one day; beſides, I never knew that this ordinance could be adminiſtered by *ſprinkling*, in much leſs time than by immerſion.

"The next caſe to which I ſhall call your attention, is that of Philip and the Eunuch, which is thought, by *ſome*, *very much* to favor baptizing by immerſion." *Quere*, Can it be thought by *any*, *very much* to favor baptizing by ſprinkling? "In this relation we are informed, that they went both of them down *into the water*, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him."

"Now" ſays he, "in the firſt place our brethren muſt *ſuppoſe* that there was a ſufficient

depth

depth of water to dip the Eunuch in, which they know nothing about." But this paſſage leaves no room for any *ſuppoſition* at all, if we only adhere to what Mr. B. calls "the etymological or grammatical meaning of the term *baptizo*, which, as Dr. *Gale* juſtly obſerves, expreſſes the condition of being *under water*."—"In the next place," ſays Mr. B. "they *ſuppoſe* that Philip and the Eunuch went into it." Pray, Sir, what occaſion is there for *merely ſuppoſing* that, which the ſcripture expreſsly informs us of? Our author has already told us, "we are informed that both Philip and the Eunuch went *into the water*;" but now, ſomehow or other, he all at once turns critic; "for even of this" he ſays, "we cannot be certain, ſeeing that the *particle here rendered into, is in many other places rendered to*, and might with equal propriety in this."—Mr. B. I hope, will forgive me, if I tell him, that he has given us but a poor ſpecimen of his ſkill in Greek *particles* or prepoſitions; for we are told (ver. 36.) that they were come *unto*, or *to* the water; but according to our author, in order to have *decent* and *proper* language, we muſt read, They came TO a certain water—and then they went TO the water! "And in the third place," (you ſee, Sir, how methodical he is) "they *ſuppoſe* that Philip *plunged* the Eunuch under water." I wiſh he had given us his plan for reconciling the above circumſtances with his mode of ſprinkling.

Do

Do you think, Sir, that any one can ſeriouſly *ſuppoſe*, that Philip and the Eunuch came *to* a certain water—went down *into* the water—and that Philip baptized the Eunuch *in* that water by ſprinkling? No, the ſuppoſition is too ridiculous; it cannot be *ſuppoſed* that the Ethiopian Treaſurer had any occaſion to come out of his chariot to be ſprinkled, or to have a little water poured on his head. Our author repeatedly acknowledges that the word *baptizo* ſignifies to *dip*; but he ſays "it cannot be *confined* to that mode of baptizing *only*." For my part, I do not wiſh to ſee it in a ſtate of confinement; indeed, were we to admit that the word ſignifies, as Mr. B. ſays, "in a *ſecondary ſenſe* to *pour on*, and to *ſprinkle*, as well as to *dip*," the latter being an incontrovertible mode, I think nothing but the miſt of prejudice can prevent our pædobaptiſt brethren, from ſeeing, that the corroborating circumſtances mentioned in reference to the baptiſm of the Eunuch, imply either immerſion or unneceſſary officiouſneſs.

"But let us now attend to thoſe caſes, wherein we are informed of the ordinance being performed in different houſes." By what means he obtained this information I cannot tell. "Such, for inſtance, as Saul's baptiſm in the houſe of Judas, the Diſciples in the houſe of Cornelius, and the Jailor's in a like ſituation.

Now

Now before theſe people can be baptized by the mode of dipping, our brethren muſt *ſuppoſe* that there was a *bath* in each of theſe houſes, and this the Bible knows nothing *about*; therefore we ought to reject it." Reject what? who is Mr. B. contending with? We are not ſo fond of mere *ſuppoſitions* relative to Goſpel inſtitutions, as he ſeems to wiſh his readers to imagine: Why ſhould he call our attention to *caſes*, the exiſtence of which he has not even attempted to prove? Pray, Sir, where are we "informed of the ordinance being performed in different houſes?" Perhaps it might, but Mr. B. cannot prove that it ever was, at the houſes he mentions—that *Judas*, *Cornelius*, and the *Jailor*, had *baths* in their houſes, is not at all improbable, as it is well known that *baths* were common in thoſe parts at the time he refers to; but the Word of God does not inform us that the ordinance of baptiſm was adminiſtered in any of thoſe houſes; "therefore we ought to reject" ſuch ſuppoſitions.

"The Apoſtle tells us that John truly baptized with water, but ye ſhall be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt not many days hence. Now," ſays he, "the way by which this baptiſm was accompliſhed, was not by the mode of *dipping*, but by that of *pouring on*, for on the Gentiles alſo was *poured* out the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.

And yet this *pouring out* is called by the Apoſtle, baptizing with the Holy Ghoſt." And here our author aſks, with a ſneer, " Was he (the Apoſtle) right, think you?" Yes, Sir, the Apoſtle was as *right* as Mr. B. is *wrong*; the extraordinary donation of the Spirit on the day of Pentecoſt, is, with the greateſt propriety, called, a being *baptized* or *immerſed* with or in the Holy Ghoſt, when *there came a ſound from Heaven, as of a ruſhing mighty wind, and* IT FILLED ALL THE HOUSE *where they were ſitting*, (Acts ii. 2.) and to this aſtoniſhing circumſtance the Apoſtle evidently alludes. The mere terms *pouring out*, *ſending*, or *giving* the Holy Ghoſt, are neither of them called baptiſm.

" But another paſſage in which the original word occurs, is recorded by Daniel (chap. v. 21.) who informs us, that Nebuchadnezzar's body was *wet*, that is, according to the ſeptuagint verſion, *baptized* with the dew of Heaven." And why did the *Seventy* fix on that term? Undoubtedly with a view to expreſs, in the moſt emphatical manner, the *ſtate*, which the degraded Monarch was in. To ſay he was ſprinkled with the dew, would deſtroy the very energy of the paſſage, and the deſign of the Greek tranſlators, which was to repreſent him, as immerſed or covered all over with dew. Such

modes

modes of expreſſion were very common among the Eaſtern nations.

" Another place in which the word makes its appearance, and from which place the idea of dipping cannot be gathered, is, where the Apoſtle ſays of the Iſraelites, *they were all baptized unto Moſes in the cloud and in the ſea*——But then how it is poſſible for a perſon to be *dipped in the ſea*, and yet remain upon dry ground, does not lie upon me to ſhow." It " lies upon" him, however, to inform us, who told him that the Iſraelites were *dipped in the ſea*.—We are not told by the Apoſtle that they were baptized in the *ſea*,—but in the *cloud* and in the *ſea*,—the cloud being over their heads, and the waters ſtanding up as a wall on each ſide,—and whilſt they were in ſuch a ſituation, they were alluſively, or allegorically baptized. But that was not water baptiſm literally, for *the floods ſtood upright as an heap, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the ſea*. Exod. xv. 8. Mr. B. ſays now, " We " may learn that to *pour on*, and *to ſprinkle*, are " proper modes of baptizing." This, to me, would be a very hard leſſon,—to learn from the paſſage under conſideration, the practice of *pouring* and *ſprinkling*, as " modes of baptizing." Was any *water poured* on the Iſraelites? Was any ſprinkled on them? No, Sir, the bright ſide of the cloud, which conſiſted of a pillar of

fire, could not be expected to *pour* water upon them; nor could they be *ſprinkled* by the waters on each hand, for their paſſage through the ſea, on *dry* land, muſt have been conſiderably too *broad*, if we conſider their number, *ſix hundred thouſand men*, beſides their wives and children; a mixed multitude, *flocks* and *herds*, even very much *cattle*, &c. Can any one imagine that the Iſraelites were all, or indeed any of them ſprinkled? I wiſh to know how, by what means, or in what manner?

The next, and laſt paragraph upon this head, contains a number of incoherent ſentences, ſome of them entirely unconnected with the ſubject he writes upon. He denies (what pious and learned Chriſtians have univerſally maintained for ſeventeen hundred years) that baptiſm repreſents the *burial* and *reſurrection* of Chriſt, according to Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. "The Chriſtian Circumciſion" he ſays, "is the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt;" but do we read ſo in ſcripture? "Buried with him in this baptiſm (of the Holy Ghoſt) wherein alſo ye are raiſed with him, &c." and after ſome compariſons, between Chriſt and his people, in reference to *death*, *burial*, and *reſurrection*, he obſerves, that the "literal circumciſion and the *literal baptiſm* repreſented" a *death unto ſin*, and *riſing to newneſs of life*; but as I ſhall have occaſion to take notice of the above paſſage

paſſage in my next letter, I ſhall now conclude this.

I am,

Sir,

Your's, &c.

W. P.

P. S. I hope the ſhortneſs of the next, will atone for the length of this, and the foregoing letter.

LETTER

LETTER III.

DEAR SIR,

OUR attention is now called " to the purpoſes for which Baptiſm ought to be adminiſtered. " Here, brethren" ſays Mr. B. " I muſt inform you, that it ought not to be adminiſtered, as ſome have unwarrantably aſſerted, for *the forgiveneſs of ſins*." He then, in a note, refers to Dr. Gale, who, it ſeems, has offended him by ſaying that Chriſt inſtituted baptiſm *for the remiſſion of ſins*; he might as well find fault with the words of Peter, Acts ii. 38. *Be baptized—for the remiſſion of ſins*. I never knew any that conſidered baptiſm as the meritorious or procuring cauſe of *remiſſion of ſins*; but ſurely Mr. B. ought not to cavil at a ſcripture expreſſion. When I read of being baptized for the remiſſion of ſins, I underſtand no more than, that the ordinance exhibits a lively emblem of Chriſt's dying for our ſins, and *riſing* again for our juſtification.

The

The great Mr. *Baxter* himſelf, in his anſwer to Mr *Blake* upon Baptiſm, ſays, " Quoad Modum, To the manner, It is commonly confeſſed by us—as our commentators declare, that in the Apoſtles' time the baptized were dipped over head in water; and this ſignifieth their own preſent renouncing the world and fleſh, or dying to ſin and living to Chriſt, or riſing again to newneſs of life, or being buried and riſen again with Chriſt, as the Apoſtle expoundeth, Col. ii. 12. Rom. vi. 4." He then ſays, " We have thought it lawful to diſuſe the manner of dipping, and to uſe leſs water, yet we preſume not to change the uſe and ſignification of it; ſo then he that ſignally profeſſeth to die and riſe again in baptiſm with Chriſt, doth ſignally profeſs ſaving faith and repentance; but this do all they that are baptized according to the Apoſtles' practice." Here we only differ with Mr. Baxter in one particular, (i. e.) we think it unwarrantable to change the mode of baptiſm, which (as he acknowledges) was practiſed " in the Apoſtles' time."

Our author need not to have been at the trouble of informing *us*, that " the water cannot cleanſe from ſin," or " that baptiſm is not *neceſſary to ſalvation*," and that they who maintain this, " act a very *cruel* part, in refuſing to adminiſter

niſter it to children." I will venture to affirm, either theſe *groſs* miſrepreſentations are *wilful*, or Mr. B. muſt be groſsly ignorant of the ſentiments of the Baptiſts. His obſervations may be applicable enough to many Pædobaptiſts, who are in ſuch a violent hurry to ſend for the miniſter, if the poor infant is weak and likely to die; we have ſufficient reaſons to believe that Infant Baptiſm originated in thoſe very miſtakes, againſt which Mr. B. affects to guard his readers.

" Again," ſays he, " Baptiſm ought not to be adminiſtered in order to obtain *eternal happineſs*." No, Sir, I never knew any Baptiſt that thought it ſhould. " Nor ought it to be adminiſtered in order to obtain peace of conſcience thereby; becauſe that is obtained in a way of *believing only*." True, but that *believing* or faith, with which *peace* of conſcience is connected, produces obedience; *faith* worketh by *love*, ſays the Apoſtle; if ye *love* me, keep my commandments, ſays Chriſt; and baptiſm is one command which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of as *the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God*.

" But" ſays our author, " what ought baptiſm to be adminiſtered for?" He anſwers, " Baptiſm is an ordinance of the Goſpel,"—it is ſo—" in which the ſubject is externally *ſeparated* from

from the unbaptized *Jews* or *Heathens*." No, the ſubject ought to be *ſeparated* from *Jews* and *Heathens*, by a profeſſion of faith and repentance, *before* they can be ſcripturally baptized—he adds, "and ſolemnly *dedicated* to God." Why *dedicated* by baptiſm any more than by prayer?—"By the application of water to his body?" Pray to what part of his body?—"for the purpoſe of *initiating* him into the Goſpel diſpenſation, and of giving him a *ceremonial* or *legal* right to all the external privileges of the ſame." Here I need not add to the remarks already made upon the ceremonial rites, in the other letters.

"This ordinance of baptiſm is moreover of ſpiritual ſignification; and points out the neceſſity and nature of the work of the ſpirit in the heart." Yes, and as the excellent Dr. Goodwin obſerves on this ſubject;* "The eminent thing, ſignified and repreſented in baptiſm, is not ſimply the Blood of Chriſt as it waſheth us from ſin, but there is a farther repreſentation of Chriſt's *death*, *burial*, and *reſurrection*, in the baptized's being firſt *buried* under water, and then *riſing* out of it—therefore it is ſaid we are *buried* with him in baptiſm, and wherein we are *riſen* with him."

I have now finiſhed my remarks on Mr. B.'s

 pamphlet;

* Vid. Goodwin's Support of Faith, p. 54. Quarto Edit.

pamphlet; the remaining part of it contains only a recapitulation, or rather a repetition of what has been ſaid before, and an addreſs to the parents, which he concludes by aſking, "*in the name of the dear babe*, the united prayers" of the Aſſembly.

Wiſhing you much of the preſence of God, the guidance and direction of his unerring counſel,

I remain,

Dear Sir,

Your's, &c.

W. P.

EBENEZER CHAPEL, LEEDS,
January, 1793.

3504. cc. 29.